

Amendments to the Drawing:

Please add the attached drawing sheet containing new Figure 4. This figure illustrates the circuit components defined in claims 1 and 8-10. Clear support for the illustrated circuit will be found in the specification at page 8, lines 4-29 and page 12, lines 1-6, as well as in claims 1 and 8-10. The added drawing figure does not contain any new matter.

REMARKS

The Examiner's action October 3, 2007, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

The indication of allowability of claims 6 and 7 is noted with appreciation. In view of this indication, these claims have been placed in independent form as new claims 12 and 13, each of which includes the subject matter of a respective one of claims 6 and 7 and as much of the subject matter of the claims in from which they depend as is required to provide proper antecedent basis.

Claims 1-13 are pending.

In response to the objections of the drawings, submitted herewith is an added Figure 4 illustrating the circuit components referred to in the first paragraph on page 2 of the action. Support for the illustrated circuit arrangement will be found in the specification at page 8, lines 4-29 and page 12, lines 1-6, as well as in claims 1 and 8-10. It will be noted that the circuit components and their connections correspond precisely to the word descriptions appearing in the above-cited portions of the specification.

Accordingly, it is requested that the added drawing sheet be entered and that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In response to the prior art rejection presented on page 3 of the action, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the contribution of the invention over the prior art. Specifically, claim 1 now specifies that, according to one novel feature of the invention, the coffee-maker is provided with a sensor that measures the quantity of water flowing through a cartridge from the beginning of an infusion cycle to control opening of the locking device. This is disclosed in the specification at page 8, lines 8-20.

The prior art rejection is traversed for the reason that the novel structure now defined in claim 1 is neither disclosed in nor suggested by either one, or any combination, of the applied references.

The primary reference, Kraan, discloses a coffee-maker having an infusion chamber provided with a cover that is opened and closed only manually.

The secondary reference, Patenotre, discloses a multi-purpose cooking appliance having a cover that can be opened automatically at the end of a cooking operation. The cooking appliance disclosed in this reference is clearly different from a coffee-maker, with regard to the type of cooking operations that it is to perform and the manner in which such operations would be controlled. This cooking

appliance does not involve the preparation of a beverage that would require a supply of water.

In any event, neither of the applied references discloses an arrangement in which the opening of a cover is controlled in response to a quantity of water being supplied to a beverage preparation chamber, or infusion head. Therefore, no reasonable combination of the teachings of the references can be considered to suggest the novel structural arrangement now defined in claim 1.

Specifically, claim 1 distinguishes over the prior art by its recitation of "a sensor for measuring the quantity of water supplied to the infusion head, said sensor being adapted to emit at least one signal in response to measurement by said sensor of the supply of a quantity of water to the infusion head", and by its recitation that the coffee-maker further comprises means for controlling the opening of the locking device "in response to the at least one signal emitted by said sensor."

To advance matters, the specification has been amended to correct certain minor informalities that have been noted and to provide the required description of added Figure 4.

The amendment to the paragraph between pages 3 and 4 was made because it was noted that the translation of the

modified sheet of page 3 of the translation of the specification inadvertently omitted two lines appearing at the bottom of the original version of page 3 of the translation.

Dependent claims 8 and 11 have been amended simply to be more consistent with the specification.

Accordingly, it is requested that the prior art rejection of claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom, be reconsidered and withdrawn and that claims 1-11 be allowed along with the substantively allowable new claims 12 and 13.

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /jmf/
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:smb
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\S\seb\LAIGNEAU2\pto\2008-01-03-amendment.doc